DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 877 RC 008 948

AUTHOR Griffiths, Kenneth A.; And Others
TITLE Assessment of Alaska Buy-Indian Contracting.
INSTITUTION Social Service Resource Center of Utah, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Alaska Natives; *American Indians; *Community Attitudes; *Contracts; Education; Eskimos; Health; History; Interagency Coordination; Program Attitudes; Program Descriptions; Self Actualization; *Social Services; Surveys; Tables (Data); Training; Welfare
IDENTIFIERS BIA; Bureau of Indian Affairs; Buy Indian Contracting

ABSTRACT

Assuming that Buy-Indian Contracting will continue to be utilized by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and that the Alaskan Village and Native Councils will become developmental centers for health, education,and social services, this report presents recommendations based on information derived from 32 Alaskan Native and BIA administrators, 7 contracting villages, 256 nonrecipients, and 56 Alaskan Native village council members. This report is presented in 5 sections which include: (1) Recommendations (Introduction and General Recommendations); (2) History and Development of Indian Contracting; (3) The Administrator's Assessment of Buy-Indian Contracting (Goals and Objectives of the Program, Administrative Means to Accomplish Program Goals, Relationships of Contracting with Other Health and Welfare Agencies, Implication of the Buy-Indian Contract Program for BIA Staff Roles, Conclusions and Recommendations); (4) Council Members (Contractors) Assessments of Contracting (Training of Council Members, Training of Aides, Contract Development, Consultation, Contract Services, General Impressions of Contracting, and Recommendations); (5) Native Assessment of Buy-Indian Contracting: Recipient and Non-Recipient (Program Satisfaction, Type of Help Given and Needed, Program Visibility, Program Administration, Summary, and Recommendations). (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116877

ASSESSMENT OF ALASKA BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by:

Kenneth A. Griffiths

O. William Farley

Boyd E. Oviatt

Social Service Resource Center of Utah
3380 East 7000 South
Salt Lake City, Utah

June 1973

R0089948

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this report has been possible through the interest and contribution of many committed and dedicated individuals. As staff of the Social Service Resource Center of Utah, we would like to express sincere appreciation to the following:

To Bureau of Indian Affairs Area and Agency Social Service Staff for support in a variety of ways during the period of the project and particularly to Gerald Ousterhout, Perry Smith, Sam Dinsmore, and Richard Weiser for extensive assistance in the initial stages of developing the project.

To Dean Rex A. Skidmore who made many unique and valuable contributions to the administrative section of the report.

To the following research assistants, Dean Anderson, John Bagley, James Dawes, Ruth E. Gallagher, David Haggerty, Henry Lindsey, Richard Marchant, McCord Marshall, Nancy A. Osman, William Petillo, Phillip Scott, David Spendlove, Theodore Terry, Ginger M. Walmsley, and Sandra F. Wiens, for their assistance in all phases of developing and completing the project.

To Bureau staff, village councilmen and village members for their patient response to the many and varied approaches to data collection. In the final analysis, their input made the project possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY	1
Part I. RECOMMENDATIONS	3
Introduction	3
General Recommendations	5
II. HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN CONTRACTING	8
III. THE ADMINISTRATOR'S ASSESSMENT OF BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING	14
Introduction	14
Goals and Objectives of the Program	14
Administrative Means to Accomplish Program Goals	15
Relationships of Contracting with Other Health and Welfare Agencies	18
Implication of the Buy-Indian Contract Program for B.I.A. Staff Roles	19
Conclusions and Recommendations	21
IV. COUNCIL MEMBERS (CONTRACTORS) ASSESSMENTS OF CONTRACTING	24
Training of Council Members	24
Training of Aides	25
Contract Development	27
Consultation	29
Contract Services	30
General Impressions of Contracting	33
Recommendations	35
V. NATIVE ASSESSMENT OF BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING: RECIPIENT AND NON-RECIPIENT	38
Program Satisfaction	39
Type of Help Given and Needed	41
Program Visibility	42
Program Administration	44
Summary	50
Recommendations	51
APPENDICES	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Contractors' Assessment of Contractor Training	25
II.	Background of Aides and Contractors' Assessment of Aide Functions and Trainihg	26
III.	Contractors Evaluation of Contract Development	28
IV.	Contractors Evaluation of Consultation	29
V.	Rank Order of Contractors Indication of Services Now Being Provided	30
VI.	Rank Order of Contractors Indication of Services Being Adequately Provided	31
VII.	Rank Order of Contractors Indication of Services Not Adequately Provided	32
VIII.	Contractors General Impression of Contracting	34
IX.	Distribution of Recipient and Non-Recipient Sample	38
X.	Which of the Following Problems Does the Buy-Indian Contracting (General Assistance) Help With?	41
XI.	Do You Need (More) Help From Buy-Indian Contracting (General Assistance) in Any of the Following Areas?	42
XII.	If you Already Knew There was Such a Contract, How Did You First Hear About It?	43
XIII.	Do You Know Whom to Talk to or What to do if the Council or Aide Refuses to Give You B.I.A. General Assistance?	44
XIV.	Do You Like the Way the Buy-Indian Contracting Program is Run by the Council?	45
XV.	Does the Council Tell You What You Can Buy With the B.I.A. General Assistance Money	46

Table		Page
XVI.	Do You Think the Council Should Tell People What to Buy With B.I.A. General Assistance Money?	46
XVII.	If People Are Denied B.I.A. General Assistance, Are They Always Told Why?	47
XVIII.	Do You Think People Should Have to Work for the B.I.A. General Assistance Money?	48
XIX.	If You Received Help on any of the Above Problems, Who Gave You This Help?	49

BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING IN ALASKA

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This is a report of an exploratory study of the Buy-Indian Contracting Program of the Alaskan Division of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The study, which was completed in 1973, was designed to: (1) develop contracting survey and evaluation instruments; (2) obtain preliminary data for use in planning further contract evaluation projects; and, (3) to draw tentative conclusions and make recommendations appropriate to the data, that might assist the Alaska B.I.A. Social Service staff to improve service delivery and plan future directions in Buy-Indian Contracting for Alaska. (It is not an exhaustive, detailed, final work on Alaska contracting; indeed, the opposite is more accurate. It is more a pilot study to develop procedures and instruments that may be used in more comprehensive and selective studies of Buy-Indian Contracting.)

The information upon which the findings of this report are based was obtained from Alaskan native and Bureau of Indian Affairs administrators, Alaskan native recipients of contract services, Alaskan native non-recipients of contract services, and Alaskan native village council members (contractors).

Thirty-two selected B.I.A. administrators and Native Association's staff members were interviewed and asked to review the contracting program. They included both area and agency personnel holding such positions as directors or superintendents, social service personnel, contracting officers, personnel directors, and property and supply officers.

In consultation with Alaska B.I.A. Social Service Area and agency staff, seven somewhat representative contracting villages were selected for inclusion in this preliminary survey related to accountability for services provided under the Buy-Indian Contract Program. Villages were chosen to represent large and small Eskimo and Indian populations as well as old and new contract communities. The communities selected were: Barrow, Crow Band, Wainwright, Kwethluk, Nelson Island, Metlakatla, and Yakutat. From these seven representative contracting villages 256 recipients of

contract services and 256 non-recipients of contract services were interviewed and asked to share their experiences with contracting. Fifty-six council members who had had responsibility for negotiating and administering the contract program for the seven contracting villages were interviewed regarding their opinions and evaluative assessments of Buy-Indian Contracting.

Our summary recommendations for the operation of Buy-Indian Contracting in Alaska are set forth in Part I. A historical and developmental review of Indian contracting is presented in Part II. The administrator's assessments are discussed in Part III. Part IV gives an account of the council member's (contractors) experiences with contracting. The perceptions of contracting of recipients and non-recipients are considered in Part V. Finally, the survey and evaluative instruments developed are presented as well as the basic research design for an ongoing evaluation.

PART I

RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The recommendations are based on the assumptions that Buy-Indian Contracting will continue to be utilized by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and that the Alaskan Village and Native Councils will become more and more the center for the development and provision of health, education and social services. That is to say, this study did not proport to determine if Buy-Indian Contracting should be continued or discontinued, and the recommendations are intended to identify various means by which the contracting program can be improved and strengthened. However, the authors would indeed be remiss if they did not call attention to basic questions that have been identified with utilizing the legal contract approach as a means of providing social services for Alaskan natives.

A contract can be considered as a binding agreement between two or more parties as to a course of action. Technically, the contractor is viewed as having an independent relationship with the party who lets the contract. That is, the contractor receives specifications as to what is to be done; but, he can do as he pleases as long as the final outcome meets the requirements specified. This implies, of course, that the contractor has the resources and capacity to carry out the terms and conditions of the agreement. The findings obtained as a part of this study of Buy-Indian contracting would suggest it is not always safe to assume that these conditions implicit in a contract agreement do in fact exist.

For example, the specifications of a contract awarded called for the contractor to "exercise responsibility and utilize available agencies and other resources in the alleviation of problems connected with child neglect, abuse, or abandonment and/or excessive drinking, illness or other problems." It would generally be agreed that this is a pretty tall order,

even for the most highly staffed and qualified child-caring agency. That contractors also had question as to their capacity to fulfill all of the conditions of such a contract specification is suggested by their comments regarding training needs. For example, social service aides are often employed by a native council to provide, in part, the services called for in the contract. However, sixty-six percent of the contractors reported that the social service aides needed additional training, especially in the areas of working with children's problems, family problems, and drinking problems. Further, over 70 percent of the native councilmen who were involved in a contract with B.I.A., reported they had not received any contract related training. Significantly, 85 percent of the councilmen indicated a need and desire for contract related training.

The contract specifications referred to previously did call for the B.I.A. to provide "technical assistance necessary." However, the findings of this study would tend to suggest that a contract specification calling for technical assistance was not always being met. Is it possible that this failure can be attributed, in part, to a philosophy by some B.I.A. personnel that the contract is indeed independent, and that fulfillment is the sole responsibility of the contractor? While at the same time, the contractors are calling for an active role by B.I.A. staff in assisting them to build and develop the capacity and resources necessary to fulfill the contract.

As indicated previously, the study did not set forth to answer the questions we have raised concerning some of the basic assumptions underlying contracting. We do suggest, however, that the B.I.A. re-examine Buy-Indian Contracting, and determine if the traditional independent legal contract approach is the most viable means of enabling Alaskan natives to resolve their own problems.

Inspite of the basic issues which have been identified as being associated with independent Buy-Indian Contracting, we are assuming that the independent contract approach will be continued by the B.I.A. Therefore, the general recommendations are intended to relate to the operational problems identified by B.I.A. administrators, native contractors, and native recipients and non-recipients of contract services.

General Recommendations

1. It is recommended that a special task force consisting of key individuals from B.I.A. central office, area, agency, and native contractors be appointed to review current Buy-Indian Contracting program guidelines, and to restate or develop a clearly defined set of program guidelines.

Reports from B.I.A. administrators indicated that specific program guidelines and clearly defined administrative structure are lacking throughout the program.

2. It is recommended that a coordinated system of communication between all segments of the contracting program be established.

A major communication breakdown seems to exist between the B.I.A. Area Office and both agency and contract personnel. A vital part of such a communication system would be provision for feedback from recipients of services, contractors and agency personnel involved in contracting.

3. It is recommended that a systematic training program should be initiated for all B.I.A. personnel who are involved in the contracting process.

Almost without exception the administrators reported that Buy-Indian contracting had altered their roles and responsibilities. Specific reference was made to shifts in functions as consultants, community organization specialists, and activities relating to legal procedures.

4. It is recommended that a contract specialist be designated as a part of area B.I.A. social service.

Such a specialist would serve as a resource to agencies and villages interested in contract development. He could assist in maintenance functions at area level for existing contracts, particularly in facilitating prompt payments to contractors. He could also keep all agencies and contractors current as to refinement, improvements, trends, policy changes, etc., as related to contracting.

5. It is recommended that a manual on contracting be developed and distributed to contractors and potential contractors.

Considerable experience and knowledge has been gained by those who have been engaged in contracting. This information would be valuable in assisting existing contract villages to improve upon contract procedures

and activities and to provide helpful direction for villages and tribes in the process of contract development. A procedural checklist to follow would facilitate contract development and maintenance.

6. It is recommended that an ongoing program of training for native council members related to contract administration and management, and for social service aides in relation to direct services, be developed.

There is certainly much support for giving local governmental units more responsibility for planning and programming. However, there must also be an accompanying consideration to "capacity building" to ensure that local units can adequately implement the alternatives available to them through contracting. In Buy-Indian Contracting it seems especially important to provide ongoing training for those individuals servicing contracts. Contractors indicated that they believed such training was the responsibility of B.I.A. staff. If this is not deemed possible as a function of B.I.A. area and agency social service staff, then careful consideration needs to be given to parallel programs of social service contracts and training under adult education, or some other training program, wherein a service training program could be developed in each village. To implement such a program would require an ongoing series of workshops, institutes and consultation services, which would allow not only for a training and orientation of new contractors, but also a continual upgrading of services. The eventual goal of such a program would be for villages to ultimately have sufficient training personnel to administer and train for their own program.

7. It is recommended that B.I.A. social service personnel provide management consultation to contractors in relation to the day-to-day procedures of carrying out the contract goals.

A major need was identified for developing with the contractors a fiscal accountability and service accountability check list which could be administered at least quarterly with all contracting villages. The use of such data, collected for accountability purposes, could be built in as a contract expectation.

8. It is recommended that the means be provided for enabling contractors to make immediate general assistance available to needy individuals and families.

When payments of general assistance run up to three months behind authorization, as reported by a number of recipients, the whole purpose of temporary emergency assistance is defeated. Credit authorizations, advance payments on contracts, credit guarantees, etc., need to be considered as a means to allow contractors to meet existing needs.

9. It is recommended that contractors be assisted in including work experience components in their contracts.

Contractors agreed (93 percent) that able-bodied recipients of general assistance should work. In addition, both recipients and non-recipients perceive contracting as including work opportunities. Work experience components should be designed to: (a) improve the quality of life in the local community; (b) provide a meaningful work experience; (c) improve work skills; (d) contribute to a sense of self-worth for participants.

10. It is recommended that contracts include a clause calling for systematic publicizing of the contract program to ensure that all potential recipients are aware of services available.

Only 62 percent of the non-recipients interviewed reported a knowledge of the contract for their community. Also, 76 percent indicated that the native council should do more to let people know of the services provided through the contract.

11. It is recommended that systematic efforts be made at all administrative levels to communicate appeal procedures available to individuals who are denied services.

Slightly over one-half of the recipients indicated they did not know how to appeal if they were denied assistance.

PART II

HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF INDIAN CONTRACTING

The American Indian and Alaska native once possessed nearly the whole of the Americas. The Indian fished, hunted, gathered, and in some instances grew what they required to sustain themselves. They used the resources of the land to feed them, shelter them and support their various cultures. This they did without restrictions imposed by other peoples.

These early American Indians and Alaska natives were a self-sufficient people who in many instances struggled against a harsh environment to meet their needs. They were great improvisors; animal skins were converted into warm, durable clothing. They constructed sturdy living abodes from raw materials found on the land. Methods of acquiring necessary foods were, in many instances, ingenious. Their approaches to survival are still apparent in modern day living in many areas of this country.

The Indian and Alaska native enjoyed a free, unrestricted life until colonists began arriving in America. Asiatic groups had early impact upon Alaska natives while western European cultures had more evident effect upon Indians of a great part of the Americas to the South. Various conflicts arose between the Indian and the immigrant colonists. Colonists' customs were in direct conflict with Indian and native tradition, especially in regard to land use and tenure. The colonists agreed that Indians had a right to the land they occupied (Right to Occupancy); however, Indian custom did not include this notion.[1] The whites felt that they could acquire land legally from the Indian for an agreed upon sum of money.

The Indian and native customs did not encompass the practice of negotiation for land ownership.[2] As a result of the differing cultures serious conflicts arose resulting in much suffering and many lives being

---

[1] Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, "American Indians and American Life," May 1957, Vol. 311.

[2] Ibid.

lost among both peoples. Various Indian peace treaties were negotiated in the 1820's which involved the purchasing of Indian lands. As a part of some of these early land treaties, the red man was given daily food rations and clothing in exchange for his lands.[3] This represented one of the first incidents where the government charged itself with providing welfare assistance to the Indian.

With the movement to purchase Indian lands, Indians and natives were forced to vacate lands or to alter basic patterns of living. The United States government philosphy was that the Indian and native could not compete with the whites and that they would be better off by themselves.[4]

Secretary of the Interior, Caleb Smith, in 1862 recommended "a radical change in the treatment of Indians," to regard them as wards of the government.[5] The government would provide the Indian who was now living on reservations with his basic needs including ample food and clothing and a place to live. The Metlakatla Reservation of southeast Alaska was created during this period. A broad educational program was also launched during this period of the late 1800's to "civilize" the Indian with the future hope that Indians would assimilate themselves into the larger society. Training programs aimed at turning the Indian into farmers and tradesmen began.[6]

During this period a trustee relationship between the United States Government and the Indian was established. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (B.I.A.) managed Indian lands and deposited monies accrued therefrom into special trust funds for Indians.[7] The I.I.M.A. (Individual Indian Money Account) program was created with the purpose of managing monies of Indians who were judged as not being capable of this themselves. Bureau of Indian

---

[3] Federal Indian Policies, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1969, p. 11.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 9.

[6] American Indians and the Federal Government, U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs

[7] Annals of the American Indian.

Affairs personnel are financial guardians of Indians who are dependent minors, disabled or otherwise incapacitated.[8]

In the 20th century the Indian was given a greater say in determining his own future. Major impetus for this change began with the I.R.A. (Indian Reorganization Act) of 1933. The I.R.A., which abolished land severality, was binding on a tribe only after a majority of its members approved.[9] This philosophical change allowing the Indian greater self-determination continued to gather strength in American through the following decades.

Of the 1950's we read:

> The progress has been great, and it has been spotty. You cannot make over a race in twenty-five years, despite what the allotment theorists believed. It takes more than one generation to make the jump from a home in which no English is spoken, where the very sight of a white man is a rarity, where the thinking is the same as it was three hundred years ago, to full competence in our alien and complex way of life. If, while the Indians are struggling desperately to make the great adjustment, the last remnants of their land base are lost to them; if, as they fear, the Indian Reorganization Act will be junked some day, their struggle will be hopeless. It is the Government's responsibility to enable Indians to keep and use what they already have, to allow them an ordinary choice, and not the flat alternatives of migrate or starve.[10]

The 1960's saw a new direction in Indian native policy and philosophy:

> A "New Trail" for Indians leading to equal citizenship rights and benefits, maximum self-sufficiency, and full participation in American life, became the keynote for administration of the programs for the Bureau of Indian Affairs after the close of fiscal year 1961.[11]

With the appointment in February 1961 of a special task force on Indian Affairs by Secretary of Interior, Stewart L. Udall, this new emphasis on Indian self-determination began to take form.

---

[8] Title 25 Indians, B.I.A., Subchapter J. Fiscal and Financial Affairs Part 104, I.I.M.H., 1968.

[9] Annals of the American Indian.

[10] Oliver LaFarge, quoted in "Federal Indian Policies," U.S. Department of the Interior, B.I.A., 1969, p. 18.

[11] Ibid.

In the following years, termination threats were reduced while economical development, improved housing and programs to reduce Indian unemployment received emphasis and support. All of these thrusts included greater Indian involvement.

> In 1966, the Indian people were in the forefront of public attention. That year, Robert L. Bennett, an Oneida Indian, was appointed Commissioner for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The people-oriented approach was apparent in the stated policy of Commissioner Bennett. He espoused greater Indian involvement in decision-making and program execution. A new era of Federal Indian relations was emerging with the Bureau taking the form of a coordinating and advisory agency, rather than the sole primary agency concerned with development of the human and economic resources of Indian communities.[12]

> A historic special message on goals and programs of the American Indian was sent to Congress by President Johnson in March of 1968, which proposed a "new goal--a goal that ends the old debate about termination of Indian programs and stresses self-determination, a goal that erases old attitudes of paternalism and promotes partnership and self-help." The message continued: "Our goal must be: A standard of living for Indians equal to that of the country as a whole, freedom of choice--an opportunity to remain in their homeland, if they choose . . . equipped with skills to live in equality and dignity; full participation in the life of modern America, with a full share of economic opportunity and social justice."[13]

President Nixon reflected his commitment to Indian and native people. His objectives as related to Indian need were cultural and included:

> The right of self-determination of the Indian people will be respected and their participation in planning their own destiny will actively be encouraged.[14]

> The Economic Development of Indian Reservations will be encouraged and the training of the Indian people for meaningful employment on and off the reservation will be a high priority item.[15]

---

[12] Ibid., p. 20.

[13] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

[14] Ibid., p. 21.

[15] Ibid.

> Improvement of health services to the Indian people will be a high priority effort of my administration.[16]

Under the Nixon administration, Mr. Louis R. Bruce, a Sioux-Mohawk Indian of New York, was appointed Commissioner of Indian Affairs in August and entered on duty full time in September.[17]

> Under Commissioner Bruce, the main goals of the Bureau are to actively encourage, allow, and train Indian people to manage their own affairs under the trust relationship to get the Indians fully involved in the decisions affecting their lives; to make the Bureau more responsive to Indian needs; and to develop a climate of understanding throughout the United States which will permit the full development of Indian people and their communities without the threat of termination.[18]

President Nixon expresses the current government position regarding the Indian in an Address to Congress on July 8, 1970.

> It is long past time that the Indian policies of the Federal Government began to recognize and build upon the capacities and insights of the Indian people. Both as a matter of justice and as a matter of enlightened social policy; we must begin to act on the basis of what the Indians themselves have long been telling us. The time has come to break decisively with the past and to create the conditions for a new era in which the Indian future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions.[19]

As one step to encourage Indians and natives to take an active part in matters relating to them, the contracting system of service delivery came about. Under this program, an Indian tribe contracts with the government through the B.I.A. to provide welfare or other services for its tribal members. The tribe administers and manages its programs for which it is paid by the government. Tribes elect whether they will participate in the contracting programs and negotiate these contracts with B.I.A. personnel. When needed and requested, the B.I.A. may provide essential technical assistance to tribes to help them gain expertise in service delivery and management.[20]

---

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Ibid., p. 23

[19] Indian Affairs, The President's Message to Congress, July 8, 1970, p. 1.

[20] Discussion Paper Presented by Calvin Brice at the Tribal and B.I.A. Exec. Seminar, 1971.

In 1970 President Richard Nixon submitted detailed legislation to Congress requesting more detailed authority to implement the contracting system which is known as Buy-Indian Contracting.[21] Early experiences involving contracting find tribal and village governments administering general assistance payments to their needy members. They involve themselves in determining eligibility, keeping the records, and in distributing general assistance checks to recipients.

The B.I.A. is making extensive use of contracting as a means of meeting the needs of Indians and Alaskan natives. In 1972 social service contracts totaling approximately 22 million dollars were negotiated by the B.I.A. with Indian and native governments. This represented approximately 45 percent of the total B.I.A. social service budget for fiscal year 1972.[22]

The use of contracting is widespread today and indications suggest that it may become the vehicle through which Indians and Alaskan natives will find greater self-direction and sufficiency.

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Telephone Interview with Ray Butler, Chief, Division of Social Services, Bureau of Indian Affairs Central Office, Washington, D.C., January 18, 1973.

PART III

THE ADMINISTRATOR'S ASSESSMENT OF BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING

Introduction

The purpose of this section of the report is to present an analysis of opinions expressed by selected B.I.A. and native administrators who are involved in Buy-Indian Contracting. These opinions were solicited through the use of an Administrator's Interview Schedule, which was being pilot tested as a part of the overall project.

Thirty-two selected B.I.A. and Native Association's staff members were interviewed by two interviewers. The staff members included both area and agency personnel who hold such positions as directors or superintendents, social service personnel, contracting officers, personnel directors, and property and supply officers. Several Native Association administrators were also included in the sample. For simplification purposes, all of the interviewers will be referred to as administrators.

This section of the report is organized in the following manner: (1) goals and objectives of contracting; (2) administrative means to accomplish contracting goals; (3) relationship of contracting with other health and welfare agencies; (4) implications of the Buy-Indian Contract Program for B.I.A. staff roles; (5) conclusions and recommendations. In each of the first four sections, the administrators' opinions were synthesized and general trends were reported. Some actual verbatim statements were included to give the reader insight into the feelings of the administrators. The fifth section contains conclusions and recommendations developed by the authors.

Goals and Objectives of the Program

The administrators interviewed were unanimous in their belief that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had defined the major objective of the Buy-Indian Contracting Program and that the objective, simply stated, was "to encourage native involvement, self-determination, and experience in

programs that affect them." They also reported that this objective had been fairly well communicated within the B.I.A. system through staff training and various B.I.A. publications. However, some administrators questioned how well the objectives of the program had been communicated to the native groups.

In addition to the main objective for the contracting program, the administrators listed several other sub-objectives which, in their opinion, gave the program direction and purpose. These sub-objectives were as follows:

1. Provide better delivery of services to remote areas.
2. Give natives experience and training that would help develop leadership.
3. Develop skills among the natives.
4. Speed up service delivery.
5. Provide jobs for the natives and distribute income to them.

There was a general consensus among the administrators that achievement of the goals and objectives of the contracting program appeared to be limited because of inadequate administrative direction and procedures as evidenced by such things as delayed payments and lack of communication. Nearly everyone interviewed indicated there was too much "red tape" in the use of forms and clearances. Even though most of the administrators felt rather negatively toward the implementation and administration of the contracting program, they heartily supported the main objectives of contracting and were quite willing to engage themselves in the solution of the administrative problems.

Administrative Means to Accomplish Program Goals

There was a difference of opinion about a structure existing for coordinating the activities of individuals engaged in administration of the program. One key administrator said there definitely was not such a structure and that there was a real need for it. He stated, "We need a teamwork approach with key administrative officers getting together in their planning and decision making. Administrative Officers never meet together to handle these matters." Another leader commented that, "We need

to coordinate and simplify better. It's like looking at an octopus with too many tentacles." Several indicated that communication among the administrators is entirely inadequate.

In an attempt to find out what kind of an administrative structure exists in the contracting program, administrator comments regarding the structure were analyzed and the following administrative outline was developed:

1. Agency level
   a. Social workers help to originate the programs, develop reporting systems, and help to carry them out.
   b. An administrative manager assists particularly with checking the reports.
   c. The superintendent makes basic decisions regarding the program and sees that compliance is made with the law.
2. Area level
   a. Contract proposal is sent to Property and Supply where it is routed to the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer begins to check compliance features.
   b. The Contracting Officer calls in the Area Division Chiefs for technical assistance and consultation.
   c. After the consultation and technical assistance has been completed, the Contracting Officer may refer the contract back to the agency for further negotiation with the tribe.
   d. When the Contracting Officer is satisfied with the contracting agreement, he sends it to the Solicitor for a legal opinion.
   e. After the contract has been cleared by the Solicitor, it is approved by Area Director or Assistant Director.
   f. Contract is then signed by someone in the Finance Division and sent to tribal council.
   g. The compliance authority is then given to the agency superintendent.
   h. Checks are mailed to native council upon receipt of payment vouchers.

The administrators identified the Agency Superintendents and the Area Director as the most important individuals in all of the negotiations. Apparently, these individuals have the ultimate decision-making power.

However, as questions in different areas were asked, it became evident that the social workers made a great many decisions at the agency level and the Contracting Officers at the area level.

Apparently there is an identifiable-existing administrative structure for Buy-Indian contracting, but the strong feelings of frustration expressed by the administrators underlines the need for a new structure, or improvement, in the existing structure. The following excerpts are examples of the administrators' feelings about the administrative structure.

> ". . . contract compliance is uneven and inconsistent."
> ". . . we never seem to know who has the final say and when decisions will be made."
> ". . . no clearly understood administrative manual . . . the one we have is long, complicated, and contradictory."
> ". . . confusion between social services and contracting officer."
> ". . . procedures are not understood and are not clear."
> ". . . many contracts are not even legal according to procurement regulations."
> ". . . poor communication between all segments of the system."
> ". . . specific directions lacking from area office."
> ". . . need more coordination and cooperation."
> ". . . many conflicts at area level."
> ". . . system much too slow."
> ". . . everything is on a crisis basis."

Another problem area in the administrative structure mentioned by several administrators was the linkage between B.I.A. staff and native organizations. One administrator said that native sides are not give enough B.I.A. consultation to carry out the program adequately. Another administrator stated, "I recommend that natives be trained in contracting and know what they are getting into prior to implementing a contract--not after they get it." Another administrator said, "There is a political tone in everything which causes difficulty between native groups and the B.I.A." Finally, several administrators mentioned that arbitrary decision are sometimes made both on the agency and area levels which are resented by the native organizations.

While there appears to be an identifiable administrative structure existing in the Buy-Indian contracting, there is evidence it is not functioning at its optimum level. There seems to be a generalized

dissatisfaction with the structure with one specific problem area identified as the administrative linkage between B.I.A. staff and native organizations.

Many administrators made suggestions to improve the administration of the program. The following are a summary of those suggestions:

1. Develop stronger administrative policy guidelines and support for the program.

2. Allow more administrative control and decision-making power at the local agency level.

3. Clarify the administrative line of authority.

4. Provide more training for native contractors in management techniques as well as counseling knowledge and skills.

5. Increase communication between all segments of the contracting program.

6. Encourage social workers and agency administrative managers to assume joint responsibility for negotiations on initial contracts.

7. Encourage area director and superintendents to make decisions only after careful consideration of data provided by their staff.

8. Reduce the "politicking" in all areas of the program.

9. Increase communication between superintendent and native contractors.

10. Minimize "red tape" and delayed payments.

Relationships of Contracting with Other Health and Welfare Agencies

The administrators interviewed generally agreed that there has been no formalized on-going contacts with other agencies about the contracting program. Apparently, B.I.A. has done little to interpret the contracting program to the professional community. The basic comment was that there is a lack of communication between the B.I.A. and the outside professional community regarding the contracting.

In some areas administrators reported informal interactions between those involved in the contracting program and other H.E.W.

agencies. Where the informal interaction had occurred, administrators believed there had been some positive results in terms of better services to natives. One administrator mentioned that contracting had served as a catalyst in getting several agencies to work together on a common problem. Another administrator felt that the B.I.A. had counseled some native contractors about using other agencies.

The following are administrator suggestions and pertinent comments regarding what might be done to improve the relationships between the contracting program and the professional community.

1. Funds need to be set aside to help with the public relations and educational program of interpretation of the contracting program--both on the B.I.A. level and the native association level. There might well be a public relations officer hired to spearhead the interpretation activities.

2. A position paper or brochure should be prepared and distributed to the professional community or other community levels. The brochure could be distributed by both the B.I.A. and/or the native association or the tribal council.

3. There should be well-planned programs with various news media and materials sent to the press to better interpret the contracting program.

4. B.I.A. and native leaders need to get together with the directors and leaders of the major health and welfare agencies to interpret the contract program to them. Regional seminars might be developed for these directors.

5. One native leader stated that the native associations should tell the professional community about this program--not the B.I.A.

Implication of the Buy-Indian Contract Program for B.I.A. Staff Roles

Almost without exception, the administrators commented that the Buy-Indian Contract Program had altered their roles and responsibilities. In some instances they indicated only minor changes, such as, "increased compliance responsibilities;" but others stated they had changed from "seeing people to shuffling papers and doing audits." Some administrators

complained that the program had increased their responsibilities and that they did not have the staff to carry it out properly.

Some of the changes in the responsibilities of the B.I.A. administrators, resulting from the contracting program, were as follows:

1. More responsibilities in the negotiation of contracts.

2. A shift to more of a community organization role.

3. A shift from direct services and individual counseling to technical assistance and consultation.

4. More training responsibilities.

5. More legal and management responsibilities.

Most of the administrators felt generally qualified to carry out the new roles and responsibilities. However, several indicated that there needed to be more training among B.I.A. personnel to help them become more competent as consultants and community organization leaders. Also, it was expressed that staff members need additional knowledge and understanding regarding contracts, legal matters, and management procedures. One administrator felt that training should be much more consistent for B.I.A. contracting personnel and that all new staff members should be systematically trained.

Most of those interviewed indicated that the B.I.A. had made some beginning attempts to orient staff members regarding new responsibilities but felt that these had been inadequate and lacking in some places and agencies. The general impression was that there has not been an adequate amount of orientation and training for the B.I.A. staff to understand and carry out the Buy-Indian Contracting Program effectively.

Administrator suggestions for assisting the B.I.A. staff to carry out their responsibilities with the Buy-Indian contracts were as follows.

1. Create a simplified and clear set of guidelines and objectives for the contracting program which could be used as a central core for all training activities.

2. Sponsor more in-service training, particularly at the local agency level.

3. Sponsor short-term, small seminars and include both contractors and B.I.A. personnel.

4. Sponsor workshops on managerial training.

5. Sponsor workshops with communication as a major emphasis.

6. Work out more specific instructions regarding patterns to be followed by contractors and others involved in the program.

7. Provide seminars which would involve both B.I.A. and native personnel.

8. Invite professional personnel from universities to train the aides and B.I.A. personnel.

9. Traing and encourage B.I.A. leaders to involve the Indians more in the initial parts of the contracting.

10. Simplify the program and then teach all B.I.A. personnel the essentials of the program.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the data presented in the other four sections of this report and from the general impressions gained through the personnel interviews, the authors have developed some general conclusions and recommendations. Because of the limitations of this pilot study which includes such things as a small selected sample and self-report data, the reader should be cautioned to view these conclusions as a beginning effort rather than a definitive result. In this section conclusions which point out both the strengths and the weaknesses of the program are reported. Accompanying those conclusions, which indicate program weakness, are recommendations for improvement.

The general conclusion the authors came to was that Buy-Indian contracting seems to have great potential and can become a decided asset for the native people. The ideas of native self-determination and involvement were perceived as being sound. The localization of the program within native populations and within their own geographical areas seemed to gain widespread approval.

Only a few of those interviewed had mixed feelings regarding the program. One administrator said that Buy-Indian contracting should be abolished because ". . . it was causing difficulties rather than helping." Another administrator stated, "We are rewarding incompetency by giving money and status to natives who are not properly trained and, therefore, do not do a job." A third administrator said that this program is "a wonderful dream, but it is a mistake because millions of dollars are spent by people who do not have an ounce of training."

Another conclusion the authors came to was that contracting can be a vehicle for political and administrative maturing of natives. It can provide the natives an opportunity for feeling a sense of satisfaction and pride in doing their "own thing."

A third conclusion which indicates program strength was that apparently contracting is providing a more effective "delivery of services," particularly in remote areas. The natives get faster services, more personal contacts, and probably feel more at ease and communicate better with one of their own race.

In the area of program weaknesses, the authors concluded that specific program guidelines and clearly defined administrative structure are lacking throughout the program. It is recommended that a special task force consisting of key individuals from B.I.A. central office, area, agency, and native contractors should be appointed to study current program guidelines of Buy-Indian contracting and to either develop or restate a clearly defined set of guidelines. Also, the task force should be charged with the responsibility of creating an administrative structure that would most efficiently facilitate the objectives of the program.

A second conclusion in the area of program weakness was that native contractors lack skills in both administrative and counseling tasks. It is recommended that an intense effort should be made by B.I.A. to train native contractors in both the administrative and social service areas. Without intensive training, at least in the initial stages, the contracting program could be very ineffectual. The training effort would probably increase the cost of contracting significantly, but

native training seems to be vital to the thrust of the whole program and actually would be cheaper as native contractors begin to function more efficiently.

Another conclusion which may indicate problems in the Buy-Indian Contracting Program is that there appears to be inadequate communication. A major communication breakdown seems to be between the area office and both agency and contractor personnel. It is recommended that a system for communication between all segments of the contracting program should be created, or if one already exists, it should be re-emphasized. Perhaps part of the communication system could be a monthly bulletin which would carry pertinent news items which may originate from central office, area, agency, or contractor. One vital part of the communication system would be a provision for facilitating continual feedback from recipients of services, contractors and agency personnel.

A final conclusion was that the orientation and training of B.I.A. staff with regards to Buy-Indian contracting has not been sufficient. It is recommended that a systematic training program should be initiated for all B.I.A. personnel who are involved in the contracting process. Special emphasis could be placed on role definition.

PART IV

COUNCIL MEMBERS (CONTRACTORS) ASSESSMENTS OF CONTRACTING

In this section we will present the opinions, attitudes and evaluative assessments of the 56 council members' experiences with Buy-Indian Contracting. The following areas will be specifically addressed:

1. Training of council members.
2. Training of aides.
3. Contract development.
4. Consultation.
5. Contract services.
6. General impressions of contracting.
7. Recommendations.

Training of Council Members

Consideration of the data presented in Table I indicates contractors feel a lack of training for contract management and administration. Over 70 percent of original and new councilmen indicated having had no contract related training. Even among the original council members who have been on the councils since the beginning of contracting in their village, less than half (22 compared ot 15) indicate having had contract related training.

In commenting on the quality of the training received, fifteen of the sixteen council members who had received training saw the training as being good or excellent; only one trained council member seemed to have a negative opinion about training. However, when asked about the amount of training, half of those who were trained indicated a need for more training, and over eighty-five percent of all councilmen were asking for training.

TABLE I

CONTRACTORS' ASSESSMENT OF CONTRACTOR TRAINING

Item		Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Metlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Percent
Contractors who received training:										
Original:	Yes	1	2	2	4	1	3	2	15	26.7
	No	1	1	1	1	6	10	2	22	39.2
New:	Yes	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.8
	No	3	1	3	4	1	0	6	18	32.0
Quality of training received:										
Excellent		0	2	1	0	1	1	0	5	8.9
Good		0	1	1	4	0	2	2	10	17.0
Poor		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.8
Very Poor		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
No Training		4	2	4	5	7	10	8	40	71.2
Amount of training received:										
Sufficient		0	0	1	3	1	1	2	8	14.2
Insufficient		5	5	5	6	7	12	8	48	85.4

Training of Aides

Analysis of the data presented in Table II indicates that most aides are high school graduates, one had a year of college, but two had completed less than twelve years of schooling. While over 60 percent of contractors feel they get considerable help from aides in carrying out the contract, nearly 66 percent indicate that they also believe that their aides need additional training to meet service needs in their villages. Again,

the large majority (32 as opposed to 9) of councilmen whose aides have had training see the training which aides have received as of good quality, but are very specific as to areas in which aides need additional training.

TABLE II

BACKGROUND OF AIDES AND CONTRACTORS' ASSESSMENT OF AIDE FUNCTIONS AND TRAINING

Item	Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Metlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Percent
Number of aides employed	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7	12.0
Amount of help council members received from aide in performance of their contractor duties:									
Very much	3	1	2	2	1	3	1	13	23.1
Quite a lot	2	0	3	4	2	6	5	22	39.6
Very little	0	0	1	3	4	4	3	15	26.7
None	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	3.6
Not applicable	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	7.1
Years of aide schooling:	12	12	9	6	12	13	12	M:	10.9
Quality of Aide training:									
Excellent	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.8
Good	5	1	4	9	6	3	3	31	55.8
Poor	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	9	16.0
No training	0	0	2	0	0	3	6	11	19.4
Not applicable	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	7.1
Additional training of the aide needed:									
Yes	3	1	2	7	7	12	5	37	65.9
No	2	0	0	2	1	1	5	11	19.4
Not applicable	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	8	14.2

In order of importance, councilmen suggest need for additional aide training in the following areas:

1. Being objective and consistent in giving aid (not showing favoritism).
2. Helping clients with budgeting.
3. Working with problems of children.
4. Educational counseling.
5. Working with family problems.
6. Working with drinking problems.

In interviews with aides, they suggested that the involvement in the mechanical aspects of contract management and administration detracted from providing greater direct service to recipients.

Contract Development

Analysis of the data in Table III indicates all but one of the council members who were not new had been involved in contract development. The eleven new council members were not involved in contract development and their answers were not applicable. Almost all who had a basis for judgment felt the council had a say in the decision as to final amount of the contract. Most did not feel there was too much red tape in contract development. Of concern, however, is the finding that so many council members (79 percent) seemed to feel a lack of understanding of the contract which they have responsibility for administering.

TABLE III

CONTRACTORS EVALUATION OF CONTRACT DEVELOPMENT

Development	Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Metlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Percent
Were you, as a council member, involved in contract development?									
Yes	2	4	2	4	7	13	4	36	64.1
No	3	1	4	5	1	0	6	20	35.6
Was the council actively involved in contract development?									
Yes	3	5	2	5	7	13	10	45	80.1
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Councilmen- Not applicable	2	0	4	4	1	0	0	11	19.4
Did the council have any say in the final amount of the contract?									
Yes	2	2	2	5	5	11	10	37	65.9
No	3	2	0	0	2	2	0	9	16.0
New Councilmen- Not applicable	0	1	4	4	1	0	0	10	17.9
Was there too much red tape in contract development?									
Yes	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	9	16.0
No	1	2	2	5	6	11	8	35	62.3
New Councilmen- Not applicable	2	1	4	4	1	0	0	12	21.4
How well do you understand the contract?									
Very well	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	12	21.4
Some	1	4	1	4	4	3	3	20	35.6
Little	1	0	0	3	2	9	5	20	35.6
None	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.8
New Councilmen- Not applicable	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.3

Consultation

Assessment of consultation services by council members is presented in Table IV. In general, the council members indicate an awareness (73 percent) that consultation services are being provided. With the exception of Nelson Island, the number of consultation visits seems minimal (M: 2.2 per year). Again council members who have had any involvement in consultation visits seem positive about the help they receive. A rather general concern expressed by council members related to the fact that consultation seemed to focus too often upon mechanics of management of the contract and too little upon help in coping with specific service needs of village members.

TABLE IV

CONTRACTORS EVALUATION OF CONSULTATION

Item	Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Metlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Percent
Do you receive consultation in operating contract?									
Yes	3	2	4	6	8	11	7	41	73.0
No	2	3	2	3	0	2	3	15	26.7
How often have you received consultation in the past year?	1	2	2	2	7	3	3	20	M: 2.2
Was the consultation you received helpful?									
Very helpful	1	0	2	1	3	2	0	9	16.0
Helpful	2	3	3	5	4	6	7	24	42.7
Little help	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	5.3
No help	0	0	0	3	0	2	3	10	17.9
New Councilmen-Not applicable	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	8.9

Contract Services

Some interesting patterns appear when one analyzes the responses of council members related to services being provided under the contracts. These responses are presented in Tables V, VI, and VII.

TABLE V

RANK ORDER OF CONTRACTORS INDICATION OF SERVICES NOW BEING PROVIDED

Services	Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Metlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Per-cent
Financial	5	5	6	9	8	13	10	56	100
Transportation Problems	4	3	2	6	8	4	4	31	53.6
Children's Problems	4	4	3	4	1	7	4	27	48.2
Family Problems	3	4	4	3	3	7	2	26	46.4
Job Help	4	2	2	3	0	5	7	23	41.1
School problems	3	2	1	6	3	5	0	20	35.7
Marriage problems	3	2	2	2	1	7	1	19	33.9
Physical illness	3	4	1	1	1	6	3	19	33.9
Legal problems	2	3	2	1	1	4	2	15	26.8
Budgeting	3	3	1	5	0	2	1	15	26.8
Drinking*	0	0	0	4	3	0	1	8	14.3
Homemaking	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	7	12.5
Family Planning	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	7.1
Fuel*	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.8
Professional counseling*	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.8

*Spontaneous response not suggested on questionnaire

TABLE VI

RANK ORDER OF CONTRACTORS INDICATION OF SERVICES BEING ADEQUATELY PROVIDED

Services	Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Metlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Percent
Financial	2	1	1	8	5	11	10	38	67.9
Transportation problems	1	0	0	5	7	0	0	13	23.2
Children's problems	1	0	0	7	1	2	0	11	19.6
School problems	0	0	0	4	3	1	2	10	17.9
Job help	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	7	12.5
Drinking*	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	5	8.9
Family problems	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	5	8.9
Budgeting	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	5.4
Physical illness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.6
Homemaking	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.8
Family planning	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.8
Marriage problems	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.8
Legal problems	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.8

*Spontaneous response not suggested on questionnaire.

TABLE VII

RANK ORDER OF CONTRACTORS INDICATION OF SERVICES NOT ADEQUATELY PROVIDED

Services	Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Matlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Percent
Drinking*	2	3	0	4	2	7	2	20	35.7
Family Problems	0	0	1	3	1	5	3	13	23.2
Children's problems	2	0	0	3	0	2	1	8	14.3
Marriage problems	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	6	10.7
Job help	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	4	7.1
Transportation Problems	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	4	7.1
Budgeting	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	7.1
School problems	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.4
Legal problems	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	5.4
Professional Counseling*	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	5.4
Homemaking	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.6
Family planning	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.6
Day care*	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.6
Financial	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.8
Foster home*	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.8
Aging*	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1.8
Housing*	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.8

*Spontaneous response not suggested on questionnaire

The fact that the council members see themselves as being engaged in providing most services which a social service contract should provide is a positive indication of their recognition of need and an active involvement in trying to meet these service needs. However, financial aid, which is the main emphasis of the contract, seems to be the only one they indicated (68 percent) as being quite adequately met.

Drinking was purposefully excluded from the list of services suggested to council members. In all instances where indicated, it came as a spontaneous response. Because of this approach, the fact that alcohol is viewed as the problem least adequately provided for seems even more significant.

The configuration of those services viewed as not adequately provided seems further to center very clearly in the family interaction areas with drinking, family problems, children's problems and marriage problems in that order, as services least adequately met.

General Impressions of Contracting

A look at the data presented in Table VIII indicates a very positive overall impression of council members towards the contract program. Council members not only feel that contracting is a good program for their community, but that it is a more desirable approach than the previous program administered totally by B.I.A. staff. A consistent concern was expressed by council members about the time lapse between the granting of general assistance and the awarding of funds. Council members indicated that many times general assistance grants were authorized but that in the one or two months that elapse before recipients receive their check, needs go unmet and when checks do come needs may be non-existent.

There was nearly unanimous agreement (93 percent) among council members that able-bodied recipients of general assistance should work. This seems to be a consistent feeling among many Indian groups and has resulted in work experience programs being developed by many tribal groups across the country.

A number of contractors expressed concern about the time required to get payments made. Grants are approved but clients may go from one to three months before getting aid or villages go that long in getting reimbursed for monies paid out.

TABLE VIII

CONTRACTORS GENERAL IMPRESSION OF CONTRACTING

Item	Barrow No.	Crow Band No.	Wainwright No.	Kwethluk No.	Nelson Island No.	Metlakatla No.	Yakutat No.	Total	Per-cent
Is contracting a good program for your community?									
Yes	5	5	6	9	8	13	10	56	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Are you providing necessary and useful services?									
Yes	5	5	6	9	8	13	10	56	100
No	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Do the people know how to apply for general assistance?									
Yes	4	5	6	9	8	10	9	51	90.8
No	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	8.9
Has the council had to deny general assistance to some people?									
Yes	5	4	4	5	3	5	3	29	51.6
No	0	1	2	4	5	8	7	27	48.1
Does the council require aid recipients to work for their money?									
Yes	0	4	0	2	1	9	10	26	46.3
No	5	1	6	7	7	4	0	30	53.4
Do you, personally, think healthy people should work for their money?									
Yes	4	5	4	9	7	13	10	52	92.6
No	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	4	7.1

Recommendations

On the basis of these data collected from council members, it seems essential that:

1. An ongoing program of training for council members related to contract administration and management and for aides in relation to direct services be developed. It is traditional that we expect those with whom we contract to have the capacity to carry out the contract they have made. In Buy-Indian Contracting, however, it seems necessary to see the ongoing training of council members and aides as we would the inservice, or staff development, training of agency social service staff. These people are as much an extension of social service staff as any regular line staff member and will require continual training as all staff does if they are to function effectively. It this is not possible as a function of area and agency social service staff, then careful consideration needs to be given to parallel programs of social services contracts and training under adult education, or some other training program, wherein adult education would develop a service training program in each village where social services provides a service contract. To implement such a program would require a small team of specialists involved in providing a continuous series of workshops, institutes and consultation services on a regional or village basis. Such a program would allow not only for a training and orientation of new council members but also a continual upgrading of training. This should assist villages to ultimately have enough trained personnel to be self sufficient, to administer and train for their own program.

Council members indicated that they felt that such training was the responsibility of B.I.A. staff, but most indicated a desire to work closely with the training staff to get their ideas into training and to do as much of the training as possible through their own village members.

2. Training, consultation services for council members and aides should be viewed as the responsibility of the training unit of social services or adult education. Management consultation, in relation to the day-to-day mechanical procedures of carrying out the grant objectives, would become the responsibility of B.I.A. social services workers. The major focus here would seem to be on developing with the councils a simple fiscal accountability and service accountability check list which should be administered,

at least quarterly, with all contracting villages. The instruments developed as a part of this study could serve as a basis of such a checklist. Use of such data collected, developed for accountability purposes, could be built in as a contract expectation.

3. A careful evaluation of ways to allow villages to make immediate general assistance available to needy individuals and families should be undertaken. Credit authorizations, advance payments on contracts, credit guarantees, etc., need to be considered as a means to allow village councils to meet existing needs. When payments of general assistance run up to three months behind authorization, the whole purpose of temporary emergency needs assistance is defeated.

4. It seems indicated that contractors should be assisted to build in work experience components of their contracts. Since contractors agree (93 percent) that able-bodied recipients of general assistance should work, work experience components should be designed to: (a) improve the quality of life in the local community; (b) provide recipients with a meaningful work experience that will improve their work skills; (c) provide constructive work experience which can contribute to a sense of self-worth among Indians and native peoples. In this regard, a "cook book" of work experience program possibilities would be of great value. This should reflect what is known of work experience programs' successes and failures and any direction that could be given to those, considering similar work programs.

5. A manual on contracting should be developed and liberally distributed to assist existing contracting villages to improve upon contract procedures and activities and to provide helpful direction for villages or tribes that are considering, or in the process of contract development. Much experience and knowledge has been gained by those who have been engaged in contracting, but this information obviously needs to be pulled together in one document, perhaps on a bureau-wide basis. Some sample contracts would be helpful in this regard with particular emphasis upon outlines of accountability expectations and procedures for maintaining such accountability.

A procedural checklist to follow, including titles and persons to contact, would also facilitate contract development and maintenance.

6. A contracting specialist needs to be designated as a part of area social service staff; or one of the area staff should have this specific responsibility included as a part of his job description. This person would serve as a resource to agencies and villages interested in contract development. He could assist in maintenance functions at area level for existing contracts. In particular, he could act to facilitate prompt payments to contractors. He should serve as the means of keeping all agencies and contractors current as to refinement, improvements, new trends, policy changes, etc., related to contracting.

A major responsibility would be developing and maintaining some simple evaluative procedures to be included in all contracts as a means of achieving accountability for present contracts and providing improvements in services delivered under future contract programs.

PART V

NATIVE ASSESSMENT OF BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING: RECIPIENT AND NON-RECIPIENT

In any assessment of a service delivery system the consumer's feedback is an important feature. In this section, data from the native recipients of Buy-Indian contracting are presented and analyzed. In addition, this part of the report includes data obtained from non-recipients or natives living in the village. By obtaining both sets of data it was hoped that native feelings and perceptions about Buy-Indian contracting could be assessed more accurately. Also, obtaining data from recipients and non-recipients allowed comparisons between the two groups.

The sample consisted of recipients and non-recipients of Buy-Indian contracting from seven areas. The sample distribution is presented in Table IX.

TABLE IX

DISTRIBUTION OF RECIPIENT AND NON-RECIPIENT SAMPLE

	Recipient	Non-Recipient
Barrow	38	48
Crow Band	52	57
Kwethluck	27	31
Metlakatla	26	28
Nelson Islands	44	44
Wainwright	27	19
Yakutat	38	25
	252	252

The recipient sample was selected through the use of B.I.A. records and included the total recipient populations in many areas. When the total recipient populations were not used, random sampling was attempted. Attempts were also made to utilize techniques of random sampling to select non-recipients for the study. However, it soon became

apparent that available records and lists of both recipients and non-recipients were incomplete and in some cases almost unusable. Research assistants in the seven areas had to improvise a great deal to obtain the sample which would raise questions about the representativeness of the sample.

In addition to the problems created by the sampling, this part of the report was also limited by the lack of standardized procedures for filling out the questionnaires. The research design for the project required that the research assistants would train the social service aide or volunteers to deliver the questionnaires into the communities, to assist in filling out the questionnaires, and then to monitor the returns to assure completeness, etc. The training program was not as successful as hoped and in some cases the research assistants themselves had to move into the communities to facilitate obtaining the questionnaires. This process detracted from the standardization of questionnaire administration but was justified in view of the difficult job it is to obtain data from the isolated Alaskan communities.

Regardless of the limitations of this section of the report, the data that were generated represent a good beginning in obtaining the consumers assessment of a program that affects their lives and the life of their community. This section is divided into the following parts: (1) Program Satisfaction, (2) Type of Help Given and Needed, (3) Program Visibility, (4) Program Administration, (5) Summary, and (6) Recommendations.

Program Satisfaction

In the area of program satisfaction both recipients and non-recipients seemed to like the contracting program. When asked if they thought most of the people in the village liked the B.I.A. General Assistance Contracting Program, 94 percent of the recipients and 82 percent of the non-recipients responded yes. Likewise, when asked how they liked this program 94 percent of the recipients and 78 percent of the non-recipients responded favorably.

Even in the somewhat difficult areas of providing enough financial support and responding quickly the recipients were generally favorable. When

the recipients were asked if they got enough money when they applied for help, 66 percent indicated yes, while 31 percent responded with a no. When they were asked if this help came quickly enough, 70 percent thought that it did.

There were a few negative comments written on the questionnaires of the 31 percent of the recipients who indicated some dissatisfaction. Some of these comments were:

"No. Always run short."
"No. Need more--have alot of children."
"Yes. But they only give you so much."
"No. Store prices are really high."
"Enough in the summer, but not in the winter."
"Not always."
"No. Takes too long, about three weeks."
"No. Too slow."
"No. Have to wait over a month."

In an attempt to get at more specific items of program satisfaction, recipients and non-recipients were asked to check various program categories that they particularly liked. The response on this check list was very poor, but 21 percent of the recipients and 14 percent of the non-recipients did check the financial help category. Some of the positive comments attached to this question were:

"When people need help with buying food, when there is no job."
"Good for people when they need help, like if they are sick or go to the hospital."
"It helps the people who have no job at all to provide food on the table."
"Helps a lot of people; kids are much healthier."
"Well it enabled me to finish my schooling which was great. Helped on clothing and rent."

On the other hand, some recipients and non-recipients attached negative comments to the check list of program categories. Their comments were:

"Might make some people lazy."
"Some people get too dependent on it when they could be on the job."
"They do not do enough for the real problems of the town."
"It is not explained to the people."
"The aide should give families equal amounts of money every month."
"Lots of big promises but no action."
"If they drink with it or spend on things they don"t need."
"They don't help with the drinking problem."
"Children don't get spending money when in school."
"Need better communication. I don't know about the program until last year."
"Quicker services and better trained people."

Type of Help Given and Needed

One of the central questions that needed to be answered in this study concerned the issue of what services the recipients and non-recipients felt they were receiving, and what they thought they needed in addition to what they were getting.

Concerning the kinds of problems the Buy-Indian Contracting program "was" helping with, 66 percent of the recipients and 55 percent of the non-recipients indicated financial assistance. This was the only response category that more than 50 percent of both the recipients and the non-recipients marked. The second most responded to category concerned help with jobs; here 52 percent of the recipients and 46 percent of the non-recipients thought they were being helped. The total range of responses, in descending order, is given in Table X.

TABLE X

WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING PROBLEMS DOES THE BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING (GENERAL ASSISTANCE) HELP WITH?

Responses to Categories	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Financial	166	65.9	139	55.2
Jobs	132	52.4	115	45.6
Transportation	89	35.3	66	26.2
Physical Illness	76	30.2	56	22.2
School Problems	61	24.2	64	25.4
Family Problems	65	25.8	58	23.0
Homemaking	71	28.2	40	15.9
Children's Problems	51	20.2	56	22.2
Legal Problems	30	11.9	30	11.9
Budgeting	33	13.1	20	7.9
Food	28	11.1	18	7.1
Marriage Problems	22	8.7	19	7.5
Clothing	10	4.0	19	7.5
Fuel	14	5.6	13	5.2
Drinking	13	5.2	Not Given	
Family Planning	11	4.4	8	3.2
Don't Know	6	2.4	35	13.9
No Response	4	1.6	16	6.3

When asked what they needed more help with, both recipients and non-recipients responded to the categories dealing with financial assistance (money) and jobs most often, as shown in Table XI.

TABLE XI

DO YOU NEED (MORE) HELP FROM BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING (GENERAL ASSISTANCE) IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING AREAS?

Responses to Categories	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Financial	81	32.1	70	27.8
Jobs	78	31.0	47	18.7
Transportation	65	25.8	45	17.9
Homemaking	47	18.7	40	15.9
School Problems	40	15.9	33	13.1
Family Problems	38	15.1	34	13.5
Physical Illness	35	13.9	36	14.3
Children's Problems	23	9.1	24	9.5
Legal Problems	28	11.1	19	7.5
Budgeting	21	8.3	16	6.3
Drinking	12	4.8	8	3.2
Family Planning	10	4.0	8	3.2
Marriage Problems	8	3.2	11	4.4
Food	7	2.8	Not Given	
Fuel	3	1.2	Not Given	
Other	22	8.7	34	13.5
No--None	34	13.5	56	22.2
No response	35	13.9	49	19.4

As can be seen from the above two tables, the recipients and the non-recipients felt that Buy-Indian contracting was helping with financial, jobs and transportation items and these same three items also headed the list of areas where more help was needed. Because of the similarity of the two lists it can be inferred that Buy-Indian contracting is at least focused on the proper need areas.

Program Visibility

The area of program visibility is extremely important since people have to know of a program before they can take advantage of what it has to offer. It was assumed that the recipients were knowledgeable of the

existence of the program since they were utilizing it; therefore, only the non-recipients were asked if they knew of the council's contract with the B.I.A. to administer the villages' general assistance program. In response to this question, 62 percent indicated that they had prior knowledge of the program. Table XII indicates where they received this information.

TABLE XII

IF YOU ALREADY KNEW THERE WAS SUCH A CONTRACT, HOW DID YOU FIRST HEAR ABOUT IT?

Responses	Number	Percent
A member of the council told me.	46	18.0
Someone who had received money told me.	57	27.6
A social service aide told me.	24	9.5
I read about it.	9	3.6
Other.	41	16.3
No response.	74	29.4

When the non-recipients were asked if they thought that most of the other people in the community knew of the contracting program, 59 percent responded yes. However, 76 percent of the non-recipients felt the council should do more to let the people know about the program. Comments taken from some of the non-recipient questionnaires illustrate the lack of knowledge some people had concerning certain aspects of the contracting program:

"I don't know about the program and don't think anyone knows about it."
"We need to know who is eligible and the rules."
"This is the first I've heard of the program."
"I would have liked to have known of it earlier."
"Can't answer question, have no information about program."
"Lots of people don't understand it."

In order to find out more about the visibility of the contracting program both recipients and non-recipients were asked if they thought most people knew they could apply to the council for services other than money. In response to this question 46 percent of the recipients and

41 percent of the non-recipients responded positively. Negative responses to this question accounted for 44 percent of the recipients and 41 percent of the non-recipients.

Another important aspect of the program that should be visible was the right of appeal. To get at this issue the recipients and non-recipients were asked if they knew to whom they could turn if they were refused assistance, as shown in Table XIII.

TABLE XIII

DO YOU KNOW WHOM TO TALK TO OR WHAT TO DO IF THE COUNCIL OR AIDE REFUSES TO GIVE YOU B.I.A. GENERAL ASSISTANCE?

Responses	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	102	40.5	86	34.1
No	137	54.5	138	54.8
Don't Know	7	2.8	9	3.6
No response	6	2.4	13	5.2
Other	0	0.0	6	2.4

The data pertaining to program visibility seem to point toward several areas that might be considered for improvement. For instance, only 18 percent of the non-recipients had heard about the program from council members. This fact seems to indicate that councils need to publicize the program more. With the council taking a more active publicity role it is probable that the program would be represented much more accurately than is possible through an informal system. Also, it should be noted that many non-recipients wanted to know more about the program.

Program Administration

In general, both recipients and non-recipients responded favorably to the way the council has administered the B.I.A. program.

Eighty-five percent of the recipients said they liked the way the council ran the program as did 67 percent of the non-recipients, as shown in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

DO YOU LIKE THE WAY THE BUY-INDIAN CONTRACTING PROGRAM IS RUN BY THE COUNCIL?

Responses	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	215	85.3	170	67.5
No	19	7.5	29	11.5
Don't know	9	3.6	33	13.1
No response	8	3.2	14	5.6
Other	1	0.4	6	2.4

Reactions to this question by recipients and non-recipients included comments such as:

"They should tell us more about it."
"They should be more tight and not let people get it so easy."
"I can't answer the question because I don't know how the B.I.A. council helps."
"Doesn't have to be run by council, there are alot of capable people."
"When they elected the president of Crow Band they didn't inform the people of Eagle of the election. We don't get informed of some meetings."

In addition, 73 percent of the recipients and 76 percent of the non-recipients reported they had heard no complaints about the way the the council runs the B.I.A. General Assistance Program.

Among the recipients, 83 percent felt they were treated fairly by the social service aide or the council member. Similarly, 77 percent of the non-recipients felt that the aides and council members treated most people fairly. The recipients, 83 percent, felt that they were helped by the aides or council members and 32 percent said that they had been visited in their homes. Among the non-recipients, 81 percent felt that the social service aide or council member helped people.

The majority (60 percent) of the recipients felt that the council does not tell people what to buy with the B.I.A. General Assistance money and 56 percent felt that the council should not do so. Among the non-recipients, 38 percent responded that the council does not tell people what to buy, while 44 percent felt that the council should be performing this function, as shown in Table XV.

TABLE XV

DOES THE COUNCIL TELL YOU WHAT YOU CAN BUY WITH THE B.I.A. GENERAL ASSISTANCE MONEY?

Responses	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	97	38.5	02	36.5
No	152	60.3	97	38.5
Don't know	1	0.4	49	19.4
No response	2	0.8	12	4.8
Other	0	0.0	1	0.4

Comments made by recipients in response to this question included the following:

"If I get something expensive, I have to tell them."
"They gave me what the thought was right, but stress buying fuel, electricity, and groceries."

TABLE XVI

DO YOU THINK THE COUNCIL SHOULD TELL PEOPLE WHAT TO BUY WITH B.I.A. GENERAL ASSISTANCE MONEY?

Responses	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	95	37.6	112	44.4
No	142	56.3	103	40.9
Don't know	10	4.0	20	7.9
No response	1	0.4	9	3.6
Other	4	1.6	7	2.8

A wide variety of remarks were made by both recipients and non-recipients to this question. These included the following:

> "There should be direction."
> "I know how to spend the money."
> "Not unless they spend it unwisely."
> "They should tell us about the program first."
> "The council should tell people what not to buy--things like booze, toys--things people could do without."

Both recipients (88 percent) and non-recipients (66 percent) felt that a person usually gets B.I.A. General Assistance help if he really needs it. Among the recipients, 26 percent thought that some people get more money than they really need, while 23 percent of the non-recipients responded similarly. In response to the question, "Do some people get money from the B.I.A. General Assistance Program who don't need it?", 21 percent of the recipients and 19 percent of the non-recipients answered that some people did. When people are denied B.I.A. General Assistance money, 23 percent of the recipients and 20 percent of the non-recipients said that the people are not always told why the assistance had been denied, as shown in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII

IF PEOPLE ARE DENIED B.I.A. GENERAL ASSISTANCE, ARE THEY ALWAYS TOLD WHY?

Responses	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	140	55.6	112	44.4
No	58	23.0	52	20.6
Don't know	40	15.9	72	28.6
No response	9	3.6	16	6.3
Other	5	2.0	0	0.0

The non-recipients responded "don't know" to this and other questions substantially more often than did the recipients.

According to the questionnaire, 32 percent of the recipients and 25 percent of the non-recipients felt that some people get B.I.A. General Assistance money for one thing and spend it for something else. In such cases, the recipients felt that the council should give food vouchers (39 percent), talk to the people (37 percent), and teach them to spend money wisely (33 percent). Taking the money away was recommended by six percent of the recipients and 11 percent of the non-recipients.

In addition to above administrative areas, several questions were asked of both recipients and non-recipients to uncover some of their attitudes and opinions concerning the Buy-Indian Contracting Program. One question asked if they thought people should have to work for their General Assistance money; 43 percent of the recipients and 45 percent of the non-recipients indicated that they thought so, as shown in Table XVIII.

TABLE XVIII

DO YOU THINK PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE TO WORK FOR THE B.I.A. GENERAL ASSISTANCE MONEY?

Responses	Recipient		Non-Recipient	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	109	43.3	114	45.2
No	55	21.8	27	10.7
Don't know	17	6.7	16	6.3
No response	4	1.6	7	2.8
Other	0	0.0	1	0.4
"If able" yes	56	22.2	79	31.3
"If able" no	11	4.4	7	2.8

It should be noted, that if the qualification of "if able" was included to find a total positive and negative response rate, 66 percent of the recipients and 77 percent of the non-recipients thought that working for the General Assistance money was a desirable condition. Some of the comments relating to this question gave further insight into the

attitudes concerning this issue:

> "Young people should work, but not sick people or old people."
> "If they're young and healthy they should work for it, but not old people who have a hard time.

Some of the other comments on this question were addressed to the concern for the availability of meaningful jobs. On this same issue, the recipients were asked if they had ever worked for the assistance they received, 70 percent indicated that they had not.

On another question, the recipients were asked to identify who had helped them with their specific problems as shown in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

IF YOU RECEIVED HELP ON ANY OF THE ABOVE PROBLEMS, WHO GAVE YOU THIS HELP?

Responses	Recipient	
	Number	Percent
Council Social Service Aide	89	35.3
Village Council Member	31	12.3
B.I.A. Social Worker	47	18.7
Some other person	9	3.6
No response	34	13.5
Other	6	2.4
Not applicable	60	23.8

The fact that the response rate was low on the first two categories (Council Social Service Aide and Village Council Member), may indicate the need for a closer look at both program visibility and program administration.

On the next question both the recipients and the non-recipients were asked if they had ever been refused B.I.A. General Assistance? On this question only 16 percent of the recipients and nine percent of the non-recipients responded that they had been refused assistance.

The responses of both recipients and non-recipients were basically positive concerning administration of the Buy-Indian contracting program. However, even though only a small percentage of recipients and non-recipients

had been actually refused assistance, there was a general feeling expressed that the appeal procedures should be more clearly explicated. Also, clarification seems to be needed in the area of how much control the council can exert over the general assistance money.

Summary

Program Satisfaction. Over four-fifths of recipients and non-recipients felt that most people in the village, including themselves, liked the contracting program. About 70 percent of the recipients felt they were getting enough financial help and that they received help promptly. The majority of respondents either could not or did not want to comment on specific strengths and weaknesses of Buy-Indian contracting. However, those few respondents who ventured negative comments identified problems in areas such as increased dependency, not meeting real needs such as alcoholism, unequal treatment and poor publicity. The negative comments were overshadowed by the general positive attitude the natives expressed toward the contracting program.

Types of Help Given and Needed. Both recipients and non-recipients saw the assistance program as helping with finance, jobs, transportation and physical illness in that order. It is interesting to note that the program apparently was not designed to help people with jobs.

Areas in which respondents felt more help was needed were finance, jobs, transportation, and homemaking--almost the same as those areas in which help is being given. This finding suggests that the program is on the right track of meeting community needs, and in fact that the demand for services exceeds the supply.

In all the above questions and in the survey generally, non-recipients responded in the same direction as recipients but in smaller percentages, probably as a function of less program visibility among non-recipients.

Visibility. Questions relating to program visibility were asked to the non-recipients. Approximately two-thirds of the non-recipients knew about the Buy-Indian contracting program in their community. However, most of these individuals had learned about the program through informal sources. Seventy-five percent of the non-recipients felt that the council should publicize the program more.

As far as knowledge of program services available, almost half of both the recipient and non-recipient groups did not know they could apply for non-monetary help. Over half of both groups did not know how to appeal if their request for assistance was refused. It is rather surprising that so many recipients do not know about these parts of the program. The reason for this information gap is not clear.

Administration. The general reaction to the council's administration of the contracting program was very favorable, especially among recipients. Four-fifths of the recipients and two-thirds of the non-recipients reported they liked the way the program was run.

Around four-fifths of those responding said that help was given when needed and that the social service aides helped people and treated them fairly. However, only one-fifth said people were told why they were denied assistance. Perhaps more communication is needed in this area.

The majority of recipients and about 40 percent of the non-recipients felt the council did not and should not tell people what to buy with assistance money. However, a fifth of those responding felt that some people either get money when they don't need it or get more than they need. Nearly a third believed people spent the money for something they weren't supposed to (e.g. alcohol), and many suggested that the council should give food vouchers, talk to the people, and teach people how to handle money.

The majority of recipients and non-recipients felt people should work for assistance, particularly if able. The non-recipients were stronger in this belief. Ironically, 70 percent of the recipients had never worked for their general assistance. The refusal rate for assistance requests appears to be low, with four-fifths of the recipients reporting they had never been turned down.

When asked who had helped them with assistance-related problems, recipients reported the social service aide, a council member, or a B.I.A. social worker, in that order.

Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the B.I.A. capitalize on the positive attitude that both recipients and non-recipient natives have toward

Buy-Indian contracting by continuing to build a meaningful social service delivery system through the councils. The delivery system of contracting will require continual training of council members and social service aides as well as providing more specific programming consultation. It was obvious that while the natives had a very positive general attitude toward Buy-Indian contracting, they could not meaningfully relate to specific program areas within contracting.

2. It is recommended that the B.I.A. formalize the job or employment aspect of contracting. Both recipients and non-recipients perceived contracting as including work opportunities. Some natives stated that providing work opportunities had prevented dependency in their communities.

3. Native councils should be charged with the responsibility of publicizing the Buy-Indian contracting program more. It was obvious that the information natives had obtained about the program had come from informal and possibly inaccurate sources.

4. Efforts should be made on all administrative levels in Buy-Indian contracting to communicate appeal procedures. Over half of both the recipients and non-recipient groups stated that they did not know how to appeal if they were denied assistance.

APPENDIX A

SUGGESTED AREAS TO BE CONSIDERED WITH SELECTED B.I.A. REPRESENTATIVES IN THEIR REVIEW OF BUY INDIAN CONTRACT PROGRAM

May 5, 1972

Instructions

The following list of questions should be viewed as a framework of topics to be covered; however, the manner in which the questions are asked and their timing are to be left to the interviewer's discretion. The interviewer should feel free to explore reasons and motives, and to move in directions that were not anticipated.

Goals and Objectives of the Program

1. Does the Bureau of Indian Affairs have an official position as to the purpose(s) of the Buy-Indian Contract Program?

   If so, what is this purpose(s)?

   Are you in agreement with this purpose(s)?

   Is this purpose(s) being achieved? If not, why not?

2. If you do not believe an official position as to purpose has been developed, what do you consider to be the purpose(s) of the program?

   Is this purpose(s) being achieved? If not, why not?

3. What additional purpose(s), if any, have you heard from other sources as being ascribed to the program?

Administrative Means to Accomplish Program Goals

1. Who in the B.I.A. are involved in the administration of the Buy-Indian Contract Program?

   a. Of those individuals or offices identified above as being involved, what do you consider to be their respective primary responsibilities?

   b. Is there agreement among those involved as to their respective roles and responsibilities?

   c. If there is lack of agreement as to role responsibilities among those involved, where does the greatest lack of agreement exist?

2. Who has the final decision-making authority for administrative decisions at the area level; at the agency level? (For example, whether or not a contract is recommended for approval and/or approved.)

   Who should have the final decision-making authority at area, and at agency levels?

3. Does a structure presently exist for coordinating the activities of those individuals engaged in administration of the program?

   Should such a structure exist? If so, what structure would you propose?

Relationships of Buy-Indian Contracts with other Health and Welfare Agencies

1. What problems, if any, have been experienced with other agencies?

   What were the agencies?

   What were the problems experienced?

2. Does the professional community have an adequate understanding of Buy-Indian Contracts?

3. What has B.I.A. done to interpret Buy-Indian Contracts to the professional community?

   What should be done? By whom?

Implications of Buy-Indian Contract Program for B.I.A. Staff Roles

1. What changes in your responsibilities, if any, resulted from the introduction of the Buy-Indian Contract Program?

2. Did you feel adequately prepared to carry out these additional responsibilities?

3. Did B.I.A. undertake a training or orientation program to assist you in carrying out these additional responsibilities?

4. Do you have any suggestions as to ways in which B.I.A. staff can receive preparation to carry out their responsibilities with Buy-Indian Contracts?

Assessment and Evaluation

1. What problems have you encountered in the operation of the Buy-Indian Contract Program?

2. What do you consider to be the strengths of the program?

3. What do you consider to be the weaknesses of the program?

4. What changes, if any, would you suggest in the program?

APPENDIX B

CONTRACTOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. How long have you been a member of the Council? _____ (months)

The next few questions will be on the type of training you have received from the B.I.A.

2. Has the B.I.A. provided you training to assist you in running the B.I.A. General Assistance Program? (Comments)
   1. Yes
   2. No

   a. If yes, what was the training? (Comments)

   b. Was the training sufficient?
      1. Yes
      2. No

   c. Do you need additional training? (Comments)
      1. Yes (If yes, then answer d)
      2. No

   d. What kind of additional training do you need? (Comments)

   e. Who should provide the training? (Comments)

   f. In your opinion, how good has your training been? (Comments)
      1. Excellent
      2. Good
      3. Poor
      4. Very poor
      5. No training received

The next few questions will be related to Council Aides.

3. Do you have a social service aide employed by the Council?
   1. Yes
   2. No (If no, explain why and skip to question 3-K)

   a. How many aides are employed? _____(Number) (Comment)

b. How many years of schooling has/have your aide(s) completed? (Comment)

_____ (years)

_____ (years)

c. Was he trained for this aide job by the B.I.A.? (Comments)

d. How useful was the training? (Comments)

e. What was the training? (Comments)

f. Was it sufficient? (Comments)

g. What additional training does he need? (Comments

h. Who should provide the training? (Comments)

i. What are the advantages or disadvantages of a village member serving as the social service aide? (Comments)

j. In your opinion, how much has the social service aide helped you?
   1. Very much
   2. Quite a lot
   3. Very little
   4. Not at all
   5. No village aide

K. Does the Council need additional personnel to run the program? (Social worker, nurse, etc.) Specify and comment.

The next few questions are on the amount and type of help you get from the B.I.A. (Help, advice, suggestions)

4. Do you receive consultation from the B.I.A. in the operation of the contract program?
   1. Yes
   2. No (If no, explore why and skip to question 5)

a. With whom did you consult? (Comments)

b. How many times have you met with them in the past year? (Comment)

_____ (number)

c. What did you meet about?

d. In general, was the consultation you received helpful? (Comments)
   1. Very helpful
   2. Helpful
   3. Little help
   4. No help

e. What additional consultation help do you need? (Comment)

The next few questions are on the development of the contract.

5. Were you as a member of the Council involved in developing the contract? (Comments)
   1. Yes
   2. No
   3. Not a Council member when contract was developed

   a. Was the Council actively involved in developing the contract? (Comments)
      1. Yes
      2. No
      3. Don't know

   b. Did the Council have something to say about deciding the final amount of the contract? (Comments)
      1. Yes
      2. No
      3. Don't know

   c. Did there seem to be too much red tape involved in working out the contract? (Comments)
      1. Yes
      2. No
      3. Don't know

d. What could B.I.A. do to improve contracting negotiations? (Comments)

e. How much understanding do you have of the contract? (Comments)
   1. Alot
   2. Some
   3. Very little
   4. None

6. Is contracting a good program for your community? (Comments)
   1. Yes
   2. No

a. Do you feel you are providing necessary and useful services to the people of the village? (Comments)

b. Do people in your community know how to apply for General Assistance? (Comments)

c. In what ways does the Council let people know about the General Assistance program and how to apply? (Comments)

d. Which of the following list of services are you providing? (Comments)

_____ homemaking
_____ financial
_____ family planning (birth control)
_____ job help
_____ marriage problems
_____ physical illness
_____ school problems
_____ family problems
_____ children's problems
_____ legal problems
_____ transportation problems
_____ budgeting
_____ other (specify)

e. In what ways does the Council let people know that these services are available and how to apply for them? (Comments)

f. Has it been necessary for the Council to deny General Assistance to some people? (Comment)
   1. Yes
   2. No

g. What tended to be the reasons for these denials? (Comment)

h. What appeal procedures do you have when an application is denied? (Comments)

i. What social service needs are adequately being met by your present program? (Specify)

j. Are there unmet social service needs in your community? (Specify)

k. How do you feel about the contracting method as a way to handle your community problems? (Comments)
   1. Excellent
   2. Good
   3. Poor
   4. Very poor

7. Does the contracting system work well in your village? (Comments
   1. Yes
   2. No

a. Do you have adequate space and equipment to do your job? (Comments)

b. Does there seem to be unnecessary paper work? (Comments)

c. Are forms too complicated? (Comments)

d. Is the bookkeeping required by B.I.A. too complicated? (Comments)

e. How would you change or simplify existing paper work? (Comments)

f. What forms do you think should be required? (Comments)

g. What B.I.A. policies have you found to be most helpful? (Comments)

h. What B.I.A. policies have posed problems or difficulties? (Comments)

i. What would you like to see changed? (Comments)

j. How smoothly does the contracting system run in your village? (Comments)
   1. Very smooth
   2. Smooth
   3. Rough
   4. Very rough

8. Do the people of your village like the contracting program? (Comments)
   1. Yes
   2. No

   a. Do you require that able-bodied people work for the Genral Assistance money? (Comments)

   b. Do you think able-bodied people should work for the General Assistance money? (Comments)

   c. What procedures do you have for keeping information about people confidential? (Comment)

   d. How much do the people of your village like the contracting program? (Comments)
      1. A lot
      2. Some
      3. Little
      4. Very little

9. What additional comments and suggestions would you like to make?

APPENDIX C

RECIPIENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you the head of household where you presently live?
   1. Yes
   2. No

2. How many members presently reside with you in your household?
   _____(Number)

3. What is your present age? _____

4. What is your sex?
   1. Male
   2. Female

5. What is your ethnic background?
   1. Aleut
   2. Athapaskan
   3. Tlinglet-Hieda
   4. Eskimo
   5. Mixed

6. Do you think most of the people in your village like the B.I.A. General Assistance Contracint Program?
   1. Yes
   2. No

7. How many complaints, if any, have you heard about the way the Council runs the B.I.A. General Assistance Contract Program? _____(number)

8. Do some people get more B.I.A. General Assistance money than they really need?
   1. Yes
   2. No

9. Do some people get money from the B.I.A. General Assistance Program who don't need it?
   1. Yes
   2. No

10. If a person in the village needs B.I.A. General Assistance help, does he usually get it?
    1. Yes
    2. No

11. If people are denied B.I.A. General Assistance, are they always told why?
    1. Yes
    2. No

12. Which of the following problems does the B.I.A. General Assistance Program help with: (check as many as apply)
    _____ homemaking
    _____ financial
    _____ too much drinking
    _____ family planning (birth control)
    _____ no job
    _____ marriage problems
    _____ physical illness
    _____ school problems
    _____ family problems
    _____ children's problems
    _____ legal problems
    _____ transportation problems
    _____ other (specify)

13. Do you think able-bodied people should have to work for the B.I.A. General Assistance money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

14. Do you get enough B.I.A. General Assistance money when you apply for help?
    1. Yes
    2. No

15. Do you get help quickly when you need B.I.A. General Assistance Money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

16. Did you work for the B.I.A. General Assistance money you received?
    1. Yes
    2. No

17. Does the Council tell you what you can buy with the B.I.A. General Assistance money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

18. Do you think the Council should tell people what to buy with B.I.A. General Assistance money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

19. Do you know people who spend B.I.A. General Assistance money foolishly? (Waste it on things they don't need)
    1. Yes
    2. No

20. Do you think too much of the B.I.A. General Assistance money is spent on alcoholic drink (drinking?
    1. Yes
    2. No

21. What should the Council do when people spend their B.I.A. General Assistance money foolishly?
    1. Take the money away
    2. Give food voucher
    3. Nothing
    4. Talk to them
    5. Teach them to spend money wisely .

22. Do you get help from the B.I.A. General Assistance Program besides money with such problems as: (please check)
    _____ homemaking
    _____ financial
    _____ too much drinking
    _____ family planning (birth control)
    _____ no job
    _____ marriage problems
    _____ physical illness
    _____ school problems
    _____ family problems
    _____ children's problems
    _____ legal problems
    _____ transportation problems
    _____ other (specify)

23. If you received help on any of the above problems, who gave you this help? (please check)
    1. Council social service aide
    2. Village council member
    3. B.I.A. social worker
    4. Some other person

24. Do you need more help in any of the following areas?
    _____ homemaking
    _____ financial
    _____ too much drinking
    _____ family planning (birth control)
    _____ no job
    _____ marriage problems
    _____ physical illness
    _____ school problems
    _____ family problems
    _____ children's problems
    _____ legal problems
    _____ transportation problems
    _____ other (specify)

25. Do most people know how to apply for, or ask for General Assistance service or money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

26. Have you ever been refused B.I.A. General Assistance by the Council?
    1. Yes
    2. No

27. If you were refused B.I.A. General Assistance by the Council, did you feel this was fair?
    1. Yes
    2. No

28. Do you know who to talk to or what to do if the Council refuses to give you B.I.A. General Assistance?
    1. Yes
    2. No

29. Do you like the B.I.A. General Assistance contracting program?
    1. Yes
    2. No

30. How many times have you received B.I.A. General Assistance during the past twelve months? _____(number)

31. Do you like the way the B.I.A. General Assistance Program is run by the village Council?
    1. Yes
    2. No

32. Does the social service aide or village council member come to your house to help you?
    1. Yes
    2. No

33. Are you treated fairly by the social service aide or the village council member?
    1. Yes
    2. No.

34. Did the social service aide or village council member help you?
    1. Yes
    2. No

35. What do you think are the good things (things you like, things that go well) about the B.I.A. General Assistance Contract Program?

36. What do you think are the bad things (things you dislike, things that go badly) about the B.I.A. General Assistance Contract Program?

37. Do you know of any ways that B.I.A. General Assistance and Child Welfare services to your village could be improved, changed, etc.?
    1. Yes
    2. No

38. Any comments, ideas for change or improvement:

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX D

NON-RECIPIENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you the head of household where you presently live?
   1. Yes
   2. No

2. How many members presently reside with you in your household?
   _____(number)

3. What is your present age? _____

4. What is your sex?
   1. Male
   2. Female

5. What is your ethnic background?
   1. Aleut
   2. Athapaskan
   3. Tlinglet-Hieda
   4. Eskimo
   5. Mixed

6. Have you ever received money from the B.I.A. General Assistance Contract Program since it has been operated by your Council?
   1. Yes
   2. No

7. Are you currently receiving money from the B.I.A. General Assistance Program?
   1. Yes
   2. No

8. a. Did you know before today that your Council has a plan with the B.I.A. to run the General Assistance Program?
      1. Yes
      2. No

   b. If you already knew there was such a plan, how did you first hear about it? (check one)
      1. A member of the Council told me
      2. Someone who had received money told me
      3. A social service aide told me
      4. I read about it
      5. Other (explain)

9. Do you think most people in your community know about the plan the Council has to handle the B.I.A. General Assistance Program?
   1. Yes
   2. No

10. Should the Council do more to let people know about the plan for handling the B.I.A. General Assistance Program?
   1. Yes
   2. No

11. Do you think most of the people in your village like the B.I.A. General Assistance contracting program?
   1. Yes
   2. No

12. How many complaints, if any, have you heard about the way the Council runs the B.I.A. General Assistance Program? _____(number)

13. Do some people get more B.I.A. General Assistance money than they really need?
   1. Yes
   2. No

14. Do some people get money from the B.I.A. General Assistance Program who don't need it?
   1. Yes
   2. No

15. If a person in the village needs B.I.A. General Assistance help, does he usually get it?
   1. Yes
   2. No

16. If people are denied B.I.A. General Assistance, are they always told why?
   1. Yes
   2. No

17. Which of the following problems does the B.I.A. General Assistance Program help with: (check as many as apply)

   _____ homemaking
   _____ financial
   _____ family planning (birth control)
   _____ no job
   _____ marriage problems
   _____ physical illness
   _____ school problems
   _____ family problems
   _____ children's problems
   _____ legal problems
   _____ transportation problems
   _____ other (specify)

18. Do you think able-bodied people should have to work for the B.I.A. General Assistance money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

19. Does the Council tell people what they can buy with the B.I.A. General Assistance money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

20. Do you think the Council should tell people what to buy with B.I.A. General Assistance money?
    1. Yes
    2. No

21. Do you know people who spend B.I.A. General Assistance money foolishly (waste it on things they don't need)?
    1. Yes
    2. No

22. Do you think too much of the B.I.A. General Assistance money is spent on alcoholic drink (drinking)?
    1. Yes
    2. No

23. What should the Council do when people spend their B.I.A. General Assistance money foolishly?
    1. Take the money away
    2. Give food voucher
    3. Nothing
    4. Talk to them
    5. Teach them to spend money wisely

24. Do people get help from the B.I.A. General Assistance Program, besides money, with such problems as: (please check)

    _____ homemaking
    _____ financial
    _____ too much drinking
    _____ family planning (birth control)
    _____ no job
    _____ marriage problems
    _____ physical illness
    _____ school problems
    _____ family problems
    _____ children's problems
    _____ legal problems
    _____ transportation problems
    _____ other (specify)

25. Do you need help in any of the following areas?

_____ homemaking
_____ financial
_____ too much drinking
_____ family planning (birth control)
_____ no job
_____ marriage problems
_____ physical illness
_____ school problems
_____ family problems
_____ children's problems
_____ legal problems
_____ transportation problems
_____ other (specify)

26. Do most people know how to apply for, or ask for, General Assistance service or money?
1. Yes
2. No

27. Have you ever been refused B.I.A. General Assistance by the Council?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Have never applied for General Assistance

28. If you were refused B.I.A. General Assistance by the Council, did you feel this was fair?
1. Yes
2. No
3. Never applied for General Assistance

29. Do you know who to talk to or what to do if the Council refuses to give you B.I.A. General Assistance?
1. Yes
2. No

30. Do you like the B.I.A. General Assistance contracting program?
1. Yes
2. No

31. How many times have you received B.I.A. General Assistance during the past twelve months? _____(number)

32. Do you like the way the B.I.A. General Assistance Program is run by the village council?
1. Yes
2. No

33. Are most people treated fairly by the social service aide or the village council member?
1. Yes
2. No

34. Does the social service aide or village council member help people?
    1. Yes
    2. No

35. What do you think are the good things (things you like, things that go well) about the B.I.A. General Assistance Program?

36. What do you think are the bad things (things you dislike, things that go badly) about the B.I.A. General Assistance Program?

37. Do you know of any ways that B.I.A. General Assistance services to your village could be improved, changed, etc.?
    1. Yes
    2. No

38. Any comments, ideas for change or improvement:

_____

_____

_____